

reads, "Only issues and not candidates are submitted to the registered voters". What I would propose to change is after "issues", basically, indicate only issues "dealing with bonded debt for capital improvement projects." And I think that's an appropriate way to get a sense of whether or not this would be a successful endeavor, would give a sense that this is the way that the governing boards and the voters want to proceed with this particular bill, and would clear up any potential of conflict with 1114 that we were dealing with yesterday. So, for those reasons, I would just ask for the consideration of the Legislature to narrow the scope of the elections to only those that deal with bonded indebtedness for capital improvement projects. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: You've heard the opening. The question before the body is the Maurstad amendment. On the Maurstad amendment we have Senators Bernard-Stevens, Schimek, Robak, Cudaback, and Robinson. By the way, I know people are concerned about the agenda. I've...I always have to make a judgment up here and it's my sense that this bill has been opened a time or two already on Select File and it would be my sense that we will get to a decision one way or another on this bill prior to moving to the next items on the agenda. Senator Bernard-Stevens, you're recognized to speak on the Maurstad motion.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: I appreciate the Speaker's comments on that because it does solidify what I'm going to do and we're not going to get to a vote soon at this point on the bill, but I do suspect if the Maurstad amendment were agreed...I don't suspect, I know, at least from my point of view, I could let the bill go, not let the bill, I'd even support the bill over to Final Reading and move on. I strongly urge the body to support the Maurstad amendment. It does two things. It allows Senator Cudaback's concept and Senator Schimek's concepts of trying special elections by mail-in vote. It allows the experiment to happen and I don't disagree with that. I think we need to see how it works; will it work in Nebraska as well as it has worked in other states, and it has worked well in other states. They have had an increase in voter participation. I don't argue that point at all. But I do think that the Maurstad amendment would also help us so that we don't change the concept of how we're going to do the voting on all of these elections that may be coming up when we do the property tax package. This would simply say that included in Senator Cudaback's restriction on